

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

Please find accompanying this a response replacement sheet for Figs. 10A and 10B wherein amendments explained in the Remarks presented below are effected.

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 and 11-23 are now pending in this application. Claims 1-11 are rejected. Claim 10 is cancelled herein. New claims 12-23 are added. Claims 1-3, 5-9 and 11 are amended herein to clarify the invention by expressing the invention in alternative wording, to broaden language as deemed appropriate and to address matters of form unrelated to substantive patentability issues. Other formal matters are attended to that were not addressed by the Examiner and accordingly are considered unrelated to substantive patentability issues. For the convenience of the Examiner, APPENDIX I is provided herewith having a complete set of pending claims with all amendments effected therein.

The applicant and applicant's attorney appreciate the Examiner's granting of the telephone interview conducted on May 4, 2005, and extend their thanks to the Examiner for his time and consideration. During the interview, the feature of the present invention relating to event production and changing display states of the character stop areas to indicate the requirement of an event prosecution was discussed. Details of the interview discussions are presented below in relation to the pertinent subject matter of the Office Action.

DRAWING OBJECTIONS

The drawings are objected to. The Office Action states that the legend "Prior Art" is required on Figs. 10A and 10B to clarify the invention. A replacement drawing sheet of Figs. 10A and 10B accompanies this amendment wherein the legend "Prior Art" is added.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-11 are rejected as obvious over the Darrow ("Monopoly") reference in view of Hasbro Interactive and variously in view of the Oshima, and/or Stamper references under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The applicant herein respectfully traverses this rejection. For a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) to be sustained, the differences between the features of the combined references and the present invention must be obvious to one skilled in the art.

The Examiner has questioned why the claims do not discuss the example of the "fishing game" given in the specification. The "fishing game" of the specification is merely an example of an activity which the present invention may be applied to. As such, the claims do not recite a fishing activity since the invention is not so limited. The Examiner asserts that the focus of the invention

is the generation of events “on the fly.” Applicant agrees with this and has amended the claims to clarify how events in the game are produced.

During the aforesaid interview claim proposals were reviewed and the event production and changing display states of the character stop areas were discussed. Additionally, replacement of the term “squares” with “character stopping areas” was noted and it was explained that the areas are not considered limited to a specific geometric shape. Furthermore, the “peculiar value” for event production was discussed and differentiated from the value of the roulette device.

It was agreed that revising the terminology to recite “event production amount” in place of “peculiar value” would clarify that the “peculiar” value is not necessarily the values obtained by the lottery.. It was further explained during the interview that the event production amount stored was optionally based on the attribute of a given square, or character stop area.

The Office Action indicates that the terms “materialization” and “whether a square emerges visibly or not” are considered synonymous. Applicants intention was merely to express the appearance of an event production square, or stop area as now claimed, in a different manner. It was believed that the term “materialization” was not understood. However, upon further review and the comments of the present Office Action, it became clear that some other interpretation of the art than at first apparent was the root of the rejection. It was

realized that the “community chest” example of the reference presented a materialization of a Monopoly man character when a player landed on community chest and that such a materialization was being considered the emergence of the event production square. It seemed that this interpretation was being applied despite the prior response indicating that the “community chest” designation was always present and did not just “emerge.” However, since the Monopoly man character appears where he did not before, and the claims as they previously stood did not require the square of the event production to lack an event indication prior to emergence of the event production square, the basis of the Examiner's reading of the claim language on the reference became evident.

In order to more clearly present the invention, the independent claims are amended to include the following:

changing display of at least one of the character stop areas, ahead of the character, from a first display state to a second display state when it is determined that the event production amount corresponds to the predetermined value condition, the second display state designating the at least one character stop area as an event production character stop area indicating an event production is required to take place when a stop position of the character coincides with the at least one of the character stop areas, wherein the first display state does not indicate that the event production is required[.]

The above language was discussed in the interview and it was agreed that the

language would distinguish the claims over the presently applied references, in particular, the Monopoly reference.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejected claims are not obvious in view of the cited references for the reasons stated above. Reconsideration of the rejections of claims 1-9 and 11 and their allowance are respectfully requested.

Dependent claims 12-23 are added and are submitted as patentable over the cited art of record based on the subject matter cited therein in addition to the subject matter of respective base claims. Claims 12 and 18 relate attributes to event occurrences which are different from the event production. Claims 13 and 19 require that the event production supercede the event occurrence related to the already existing attribute and symbol of a character stop area. Claims 14-17 and 20-23 relate to the event occurrences being a practice activity and/or the event production being a competition.

CLAIM FEES

Two claims in excess of twenty are added. **The fee of \$100.00 for the claim(s) is provided for in the charge authorization presented in the PTO Form 2038, Credit Card Payment form, provided herewith.**

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

Applicant respectfully requests a one month extension of time for responding to the Office Action. **The fee of \$120 for the extension is provided for in the charge authorization presented in the PTO Form 2038, Credit Card Payment form, provided herewith.**

If there is any discrepancy between the fee(s) due and the fee payment authorized in the Credit Card Payment Form PTO-2038 or the Form PTO-2038 is missing or fee payment via the Form PTO-2038 cannot be processed, the USPTO is hereby authorized to charge any fee(s) or fee(s) deficiency or credit any excess payment to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

In light of the foregoing, the application is now believed to be in proper form for allowance of all claims and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP

By FJ Jordan
Frank J. Jordan

by _____
and,
Reg. No. 20,456
Attorney for Applicants

By HFRuschmann
Herbert F. Ruschmann
Reg. No. 35,341
Attorney for Applicants

Jordan and Hamburg LLP
122 East 42nd Street
New York, New York 10168
(212) 986-2340

enc: Form PTO-2038; and replacement drawing sheet of Figs. 10A and 10B.